Postgraduate Arabic Syntax Workshop
Newcastle University- UK
May 8th 2017

1. THE CAUSATIVE-ANTICAUSATIVE ALTERNATION IN JORDANIAN ARABIC (JA)

Aseel Zibin, Newcastle University

The current study investigates the causative-anticausative alternation in Jordanian Arabic (henceforth, JA), focusing on the structural, morphological and semantic characteristics of causative and anticausative verbs. I adopt a non-derivational approach (i.e. the common-base approach), in which the two variants share a single root to account for the alternation in JA. The fact that JA exhibits two processes, i.e. causativisation and anticausativisation, with distinct morphological markings, provides evidence that neither a causativisation analysis nor an anticausativisation one accounts for the behaviour of verbs in JA. Data analysis shows that the causative alternation in JA is morphologically and semantically constrained. Morphologically, all the verbs that realise the basic past template alternate, while those that do not realise it are not allowed to alternate. However, this morphological constraint only provides the necessary condition for the verbs to alternate. I argue that verbs in JA need to satisfy two types of constraint; morphological and semantic. Semantic analysis shows that verbs which: 1) induce certain type of behaviour in others; 2) denote directed motion; 3) denote creating, destroying or killing; 4) encode movement in a particular specified direction; 5) are internally caused and describe events engaged in by human entities; and 6) relate to appearance/disappearance in or out of existence, alternate in JA. The constraints proposed for the causative alternation in JA equally apply to other varieties of Arabic, such as Standard Arabic, Iraqi Arabic and Libyan Arabic. The main difference between JA and other varieties of Arabic, in terms of the causative alternation, lies in the morphological markings on some verbs. Investigation of the mechanisms for the causative alternation in Arabic is relatively new and this work sheds additional light on the morphological coding and the semantic constraints governing these mechanisms.

2. SOME COMPLEX TENSE AND ASPECT CONSTRUCTIONS IN KUWAITI ARABIC

Bashayer Alotaibi, Newcastle University

It has been proposed in the literature (following Reichenbach) that Tense is an ordering operation; ordering the event time (ET) relative to speech time (ST). The possible relations are either ET is before ST, ET is within with ST, or ET is after ST which creates simple tenses: Past, Present and Future respectively. Nevertheless, language makes it possible to express more complex temporal relations which called for the addition of another time point called reference time (RT) between ET and ST. Some researcher argue that there are two tense heads, the first orders ST to RT, while the second orders RT to ET which are represented as two separate heads in the structure of Tense Phrase (Past and Perfect) followed by an aspect head (Perfective) (Fassi Fehri (1990, 2012) Stowell (1993, 1995), among others). Others argue that there is only

one tense head which orders RT and ST, while Aspect is responsible for ordering RT to ST (Demirdache & Uribe-Etxebarria (1997, 2014) following Klein (1994)). I will show, following the second perspective that viewpoint aspect in Arabic allows for an ordering relation between RT and ET, in addition to dimensionalization as a result of this ordering relation. An imperfective aspect allows you to view the event's internal structure (beginning, middle and end) as it unfolds in time because it locates ET within RT (or ST if there was no RT), hence allowing the 'zoom in' function of the imperfective viewpoint. The perfective viewpoint, on the other hand, allows you to see one side of the event – it's left boundary only – because it locates the event ET adjacent to – 'before'– RT (or ST if there was no RT), hence creating a different viewpoint where only the end of the event it seen. The perfective/imperfective verbal opposition in Arabic thus consists of two main features [+-Anteriority] and [+-Dimensionalizaion] (following Bahloul; 2008).

Support for this argument come from complex tense constructions in Arabic, which provide good examples for showing the separation of the tense and aspect functions in the clause. The main verb shows an aspectual function: orders ET relative to RT, while the auxiliary verb (most commonly *kaan* 'was') shows temporal functions: orders RT relative to ST. These functions are also evident in the functional use of posture verbs *gaam* 'got up' and *gaʕad* 'sat' in KA. In this talk I will show how posture verbs *gaʕad* 'sat' and *gaam* 'got up' which have been grammaticalized and used as aspectual verbs interact with the main verb in the TP structure. I will show that they must be in a position below Tense and above Aspect, since they act like auxiliaries by ordering RT in relation to Speech Time, while on the other hand, they modify the 'viewpoint' aspect of the main verb. For example, *gaam* 'got up' indicates the inception of the following imperfective verb or immediateness/suddenness of a perfective verb, it thus orders the 'starting point of the event' relative to ST, not the whole event. *gaʕad* 'sat', on the other hand, asserts the duration of an event if it is durative, or coerces it to have a duration if it is not a durative event (as in achievements) in addition to positioning the full duration of the event relative to ST. Furthermore, these grammaticalized verbs show different nuances depending on: 1) the Aktionsart of the main verb, 2) the viewpoint aspect of the main verb, and 3) their temporal reference, which will be discussed in this talk.

3. ON THE STRUCTURE OF POSSESSIVE *ĦAGG* IN FREE STATE NOMINALS IN HAILI ARABIC

Eisa Alrasheedi, Newcastle University

Possession in Haili Arabic (HA) can be expressed by using a number of strategies, including the traditional 'synthetic' construct state nominal, as in example (1):

(1) bait ʔar-radʒaal (HA)
house DEF-man
'the man's house'

In (1), the possessum *bait* 'house' and the possessor *ʔarradʒaal* 'the man' are juxtaposed. The notion of possession in HA can also be analytically formed by the use of so-called Free State Nominals (FSN). In a FSN construction, an overt preposition, *ħagg*, intervenes between the possessum and possessor, conveying a possessive relation (2).

(2) ʔal-bait ħagg ʔar-radʒaal (HA)
DEF-houseof DEF-man
'the man's house'

The element *ħagg* is arguably equivalent to other possessive prepositions like *li* in Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) and *ʃel* in Modern Hebrew (MH), as in (3) and (4) respectively. Compare example (2) with its counterparts in (3) and (4).

(3) ʔal-bait-u li ʔar-radʒul-i (MSA)
DEF-house-NOM of DEF-man-GEN
'the man's house'

(4) ha-bayit ʃel ha-mora (MH)
DEF-houseof DEF-teacher
'the teacher's house'

In the vast literature on Semitic, *li* and *ʃel* prepositions are treated as dummy markers that do not vary in different contexts. Said this, *ħagg* differs from these marker in that it agrees in number and gender with the possessum (5a–b).

(5) a. ʔas-sijjarah ħagg-at Mohammed (HA)
DEF-car.SG.F of-SG.FMohammed
'Mohammed's car'

b. ʔas-sijjaraat ħagg-aat Mohammed
DEF-cars.PL.F of-PL.F Mohammed
'Mohammed's cars'

The fact that *ħagg* agrees in number and gender with the head noun, as in (5a-b), suggests that this possessive marker is an agreeing head.

As for the syntactic derivation, I assume that *ħagg* is a case assigning head that bears unvalued φ-features that must be valued. I assume further that *ħagg* is the head of a dedicated functional phrase ħaggP, in which *ħagg* forms a syntactic constituent with the possessor DP, and *ħagg*-marked phrase (i.e., *ħagg*-possessor) is located in [Spec, NP]. The head noun raises to head adjoin to a position above the possessor, Num *pace* Ritter (1991), and below the definite article *ʔal*, which heads the whole DP. I also assume, following Siloni (1997), that the genitive case assigned to the possessor is an inherent case. In order to derive nominal concord in HA, I assume that *ħagg* first probes downward but cannot find a suitable goal within its c-commanding domain. After the head noun has undergone head movement to Num, the φ-features of the N are available to Agree. Consequently, the possessive *ħagg* probes upward to find these features and is valued by them. Thus, nominal concord is established by Agree relation, which can take place downward and upward (Baker 2008, Béjar and Rezac 2009, Toosarvandani and van Urk 2014, and Carstens 2016).

4. ON THE SYNTAX OF EXCLAMATIVE PARTICLE ʔAMM*Ā* *IN GULF ARABIC*

Ghada Alkuwaihes

University of York

This paper investigates the syntactic properties of the exclamative particle *ʔamā* in Gulf Arabic. The syntax of particles in Arabic varieties has received less attention in the literature than other languages. That justifies the reason for the insufficient data on Arabic particles. Alshamari (2017) is one of the researchers who provides a syntactic and pragmatic analysis of some particles in Haili Arabic following the minimalist approach. The aim of this paper, then, is to enrich the linguistic data of Arabic by providing a syntactic analysis of particle-based exclamatives, pointing out the particle's function and distribution.

(1) ʔamā badlah!
PRT suit
What a suit!

(2) ʔamā al-badlah ħillwah!
PRT the-suit beautiful
What a nice suit!

(3) ʔamā maχbaz!
PRT bakery
What a bakery!

(4) ʔamā al-maχbaz sayʔ!
PRT the-bakery bad
What a bad bakery!

The exclamative particle *ʔamā* is combined with a nominal clause to form an exclamative, as provided in the above examples. I, hence, propose that the particle *ʔamā* is a clause-initial discourse particle which is generated at the CP-domain based on Rizzi's (1997) SPLIT CP HYPOTHESIS. I also propose that it is a functional head located at the highest projection at the left periphery as a subcase of Force phrase (ForceP). In line with Jónsson (2017), *ʔamā* selects only a Focus phrase (FocP) as its complement. Here I oppose to Biberauer's et al. (2014) view that particles lack the ability to select because the absence of *ʔamā* from the exclamative structure results in a declarative form. This declarative does not trigger the existence of the FocP. In example (1), for instance, the Determinal phrase (DP) *badlah 'siut'* is Focalised, whereas it is not in the declarative form. Below is an illustration of the exclamative structure in (2):

(5) [ExP [Ex^o *ʔamā*] [FocP [DP [D al- [NP *badlah*]] [Foc' [Foc^o] [AP *ħillwah*]]]]

Based on Rizzi's (1997), the Foc^o here is null. The focalised element is the DP *badlah 'suit'* which is located at the specifier of the FocP. The complement of the Foc^o is the Adjectival phrase (AP) *ħillwah 'nice'*. The exclamative particle does not exhibit into an Agree relation with its complement.

5. AGREEING AND NON-AGREEING TOPIC PARTICLES IN NORTH HAIL ARABIC

Murdhy Alshammari, Newcastle University

This paper examines a set of discourse particles in North Hail Arabic (NHA), in terms of their position in the syntactic structure and their discourse functions, building on the debate on discourse particles in the structure of the left periphery in cross-linguistic syntax and their legitimacy at the interfaces (Biberauer *et al.* 2014). Adopting Rizzi's (1997) Split CP Hypothesis, it is argued that these particles are merged in the left periphery, marking the Contrastive Topic (C-Topic) and Familiar Topic (F-Topic), in the sense of Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl (2007). The particles overtly mark these topics, serving as empirical evidence for Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl's (2007) approach that the proposed different types of topics are

structurally merged in different positions; they represent a morphological realisation of the heads of the projections of these topics in overt syntax. The examples below are illustrative (the unmarked word order in NHA is SVO).

(1) a. **tara-ah** ʔAL-BINT ʃaf-at ʔal-walad
Prt-3S.F Def-girl saw-3S.F Def-boy
'THE GIRL saw the boy.'
b. **tara-h** ʃaf-at-h ʔAL-WALAD ʔal-bint
Prt-3S.M saw-3S.F-3S.M Def-boy Def-girl
'THE BOY, the girl saw him.'

(2) a. **ʁedɪ-ah** ʔal-bint ʃaf-at ʔal-walad
Prt-3S.F Def-girl saw-3S.F Def-boy
'The girl, she saw the boy.'
b. **ʁedɪ-h** ʃaf-at-h ʔal-walad ʔal-bint
Prt-3S.M saw-3S.F-3S.M Def-boy Def-girl
'The boy, the girl saw him.'

In (1), *tara* marks the element the speaker selects out of a set of discourse-given entities, whose referent expresses C-Topic, the subject (1a) and the object (1b), bearing contrastive stress. In (2), *ʁedɪ*, marks the element that is contextually accessible, whose referent expresses F-Topic. The investigation of these particles shows that marking of these particles to the item with the [Top] is subject to locality, triggering syntactic operations, if need be. Hence, movement of the object when merged with [Top]. *tara* with [C-Top] projecting C-TopicP, and *ʁedɪ* with [F-Top] projecting F-TopicP, the interpretation is delivered by establishing an Agree relation in syntax between the particle, with interpretable [Top] and uninterpretable Φ-feature, and the topicalized constituent with uninterpretable [Top] and interpretable Φ-feature. Deduced here is that the topicalized constituent is interpreted as a topic *in situ*, making movement to the left periphery unnecessary, be it at PF or LF. In this line of thought, the particle operates as a Probes and the topicalised constituent, being visible in the c-command domain of the Probe, is the Goal (see movement of the object DP, motivated by the requirement that it be visible to the probe, to survive its own phase transfer). The topicalised constituent values the unvalued φ-features of the particle while the particle values the unvalued [Top] feature of the topicalised constituent. The source of the topic interpretation comes from the combination of the [Top] feature of the particle and the topicalized item. NHA exhibits other particles which mark the same intended topic interpretation as (1,2), but which cannot establish an Agree relation with the topicalized constituent, resulting in movement of the later. In (3), *zad* functions like *tara* and has [C-Top] while in (4), *tigil* functions like *ʁedɪ* and has [F-Top]. However, *zad* and *tigil* lack Φ-features, which results in movement of the topicalized constituent to the left of the particle, and lack of the clitic agreeing with the moved DP.

(3) a. ʔAL-BINT **zad** ʃaf-at ʔal-walad
Def-girl **Prt** saw-3S.F Def-boy
'THE GIRL saw the boy.'
b. ʔAL-WALAD **zad** ʔal-bint ʃaf-at-h
Def-boy **Prt** Def-girl saw-3S.F-3S.M
'THE BOY, the girl saw him.'

(4) a. ʔal-bint **tigil** ʃaf-at ʔal-walad
Def-girl **Prt** saw-3S.F Def-boy
'The girl, she saw the boy.'

b. ʔal-walad **tigil** ʔal-bint ʃaf-at-h
Def-boy **Prt** Def-girl saw-3S.F-3S.M
'The boy, the girl saw him.'

In Miyagawa's (2010) words, in Spec-Head configuration to agreement, movement is required by the computational system, which keeps movement occuring in narrow syntax as a record for the interfaces that there has been an (agreement) functional relation. Agree applies only if the particle is endowed with φ-features (1,2), but, by overt movement of the topicalized constituent in case the particle lacks Φ-features (3,4). The interpretation in (3) is identical to that in (1) and (4) to (2). However, in (3,4) agreement is only marked by movement, not overt Agree as the case in (1,2). As non-agreeing particles, lacking Φ-features, instead, *zad* and *tiqil* have an [EPP] in their featural grid, attracting the goal since they cannot mark it *in situ* by Agree. It can be generalized that the motivation for this movement is that Agree doesn't hold in narrow syntax due to lack of φ-features on the non-agreeing particle, and that narrow syntax requres a Spec-Head relation to form this agreement.

6. MULTIPLE WH-WORDS IN NAJDI ARABIC

Naif Alshammari, Newcastle University

This study investigates the syntax of coordinated wh-questions in Najdi Arabic (NA), a dialect spoken in Najd region, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. It provides a descriptive study of instances involving questions with coordinated wh-words. It turns out that NA allows such questions under certain constraints whose violations render the relevant questions ungrammatical. The study shows that these conditions are sensitive to the categorial status of the multiple wh-words, i.e. arguemental wh-words vs. adjuncts wh-words. Here the two wh-words must be fronted, separated by the coordinating conjunction wa 'and' (as in when and where did you see the man? *when did you see the man where?). I argue that since the two adjuncts wh-words bear strong Q feature forcing the relevant adjunct wh-word to raise to the left periphery in overt syntax. Because there is only one spec of Focus Phrase, NA devises what I label as pseudo-coordination. The two wh-words are combined under one XP, i.e. &P which is inserted in the Spec, of Focus Phrase. The implementation of this combination and insertion is executed through the so-called sideward movement (Nunes 2001).

7. AGREE MANIFESTATIONS IN ARABIC

Marwan Jarrah, Newcastle University

Agree relations (established between a probe and a goal; cf. Chomsky 2000, 2001) in Arabic must have a phonetic manifestation, forced by the postulated *Agree Chain record* (ACR), which is first obtained by overt Case. If overt Case is not an option, the ACR is obtained through spelling out the uϕ-features of the probe if any. Otherwise, ACR is obtained through movement of the goal to the probe.

To illustrate, when an Agree relation is established between a case-assigning probe and an overt goal, the phonetic realization of the Agree operation is achieved through case-marking the goal by the probe, as the case of the complementizer *ʔinn* in Modern Standard Arabic (MSA):

(1) ʔinna ʔalwalada qaraʔ-a ʔad-dars-a
Comp DEFboyACC read.3MS-IND DEF-lesson-ACC
'The boy read the lesson.'

Following Mohammad (1990, 2000), Ouhalla (1997), Aoun *et al* (2010), among many others, the subject *ʔalwalada* above is assigned Accusative case by *ʔinna*. Note here that *ʔinna* is not attached with any agreement suffix, unlike the cases where the subject is a pro. Consider the following sentence:

(2) ʔinna-uh qaraʔ-a ʔad-dars-a
Comp-3SM read.3MS-IND DEF-lesson-ACC
'He read the lesson.'

Within the traditional Arabic grammar view (cf. Ibn Al-Anbari 1961) and some modern proposals (e.g. Mohammad 1990, 2000 and Bemamoun 1993), the weak form suffixed to *ʔinn* in (2) is a phonetic form of the pro which enters an Agree relation with *ʔinna*. For these authors, the pro must be realized when it is assigned Accusative Case, a condition which is barely attested beyond (Modern Standard) Arabic grammar. Alternatively and following Shlonsky (1997), I argue that the weak form attached into *ʔinn* in (2) is an inflectional suffix produced as an outcome of an Agree operation. *ʔinn* assigns the pro subject Accusative Case, which is not realized given nullness of the pro. The manifestation of an agree relation between *ʔinn* and the pro must be therefore achieved through a different strategy, namely via a PF reflex of valuation of uϕ-features of *ʔinn*. On the other hand, when neither Case nor agreement are available to record the agree relation between the probe and its goal, Move is used. Empirical evidence for this assumption comes from the behaviour of the so-called discourse particles in Haili Arabic. In this dialect, there are two types of discourse particles: agreeing discourse particles (which can host an inflectional suffix), as in (3a) and non-agreeing discourse particles (which cannot host an inflectional suffix) as in (6b). The two types of particles are topicalizers in the sense that they head the Topic Phrase (Al-shamari 2017).

(3) a. **ʁedı-ah** l-binit ʃaf-t ʔas-sayarah
PRT-3SM DEF-girl see.PST-3S.M Def-car
'The girl, she saw the car'.

b. l-binit **tigil** ʃaf-t ʔal-ħurmah.
DEF-girl PRT see.PST-3S.M Def-woman
'The girl, she saw the woman.'

The relevant point here is that agreeing topicalizers such as *ʁedı* in (3a) do not require a spec-head relation with the topicalized element, unlike non-agreeing topicalizers such as *tigil* in (3b). Agreeing topicalizers are endowed with a set of uϕ-features whose PF reflex secures a manifestation of the syntactic relation between the relevant topicalizer and the topicalized element. As such, Move is not triggered, given that the ACR is satisfied by the PF reflex of valuation of the uninterpretable ϕ-features on the probe. On the other hand, when the topicalizer is bereft of uninterpretable ϕ-features, the PF reflex is no longer of help, something that forces Move to occur.